



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,236	12/10/2001	Michael L. Palmer	4232.124US1	9952

7590

10/11/2005

PIPER RUDNICK LLP
PATENT PROSECUTION SERVICES
1200 NINETEENTH STREET
WASHINGTON, DC 20036-2412

EXAMINER

ENGLAND, DAVID E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 10/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/006,236

Applicant(s)

PALMER, MICHAEL L.

Examiner

David E. England

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/22/02, 1/20/04
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 53 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1 – 5, 7 – 10, 12 – 17, 19 – 22, 24 – 46 and 48 – 53 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Buist U.S. Patent No. 6408282.

4. Referencing claim 1, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Buist teaches a method for dynamically updating a content list, said method comprising the steps of:

5. (1) altering said content list at a feed station server by implementing one or more revisions into said content list, (e.g., col. 8, lines 3 – 32);

6. (2) packaging said one or more revisions implemented in step (1) into a message, (e.g., col. 8, lines 3 – 32); and

7. (3) transmitting said message to one or more field stations for updating at least one copy of said content list at said one or more field stations, (e.g., col. 8, lines 3 – 32).

8. Referencing claim 2, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Buist teaches said altering said content list comprises at least one of creating a new content list, or deleting or revising an existing content list, (e.g., col. 8, lines 3 – 32).

9. Referencing claim 3, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Buist teaches said message alters a sequence of stories of said at least one copy of said content list at said one or more field stations, (e.g., col. 13, lines 15 – 40).

10. Referencing claim 4, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Buist teaches said message alters, adds, or deletes at least one of a text element, metadata, or one or more references to media objects, or one or more media objects to said at least one copy of said content list at said one or more field stations, (e.g., col. 13, lines 15 – 40).

11. Referencing claim 5, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Buist teaches said content list is comprised of an ordered sequence of stories, and wherein each story is comprised of at least one text element, metadata, and one or more references to media objects, (e.g., col. 13, line 41 – col. 14, line 24).

12. Referencing claim 7, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Buist teaches said message includes a timestamp or identifier, (e.g., col. 26, line 56 – col. 27, line 19).

Art Unit: 2143

13. Referencing claim 8, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Buist teaches said step of altering said content list comprises at least one of:

14. adding, revising or deleting at least one of a text element, metadata, or a reference to a media object associated with a story, (e.g., col. 13, line 41 – col. 14, line 24);

15. adding, revising or deleting a new media object, (e.g., col. 13, line 41 – col. 14, line 24);
or

16. revising a sequence of stories of said content list, (e.g., col. 13, line 41 – col. 14, line 24).

17. Referencing claim 9, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Buist said content list comprises one or more references to media objects, wherein said method further comprising the steps of:

18. resolving said one or more references by obtaining said media objects referenced by said one or more references from a media and object server, wherein each of said media objects includes one or more versions of associated media objects, (e.g., col. 11, lines 30 – 53); and

19. transmitting said media objects to said one or more field stations, (e.g., col. 11, lines 30 – 53).

20. Referencing claim 10, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Buist teaches alterations to said content list at said feed station server are implemented substantially instantaneously to said at least one copy of said content list at said one or more field stations, (e.g., Abstract, “*real-time*”).

Art Unit: 2143

21. Referencing claim 49, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Buist teaches said object and stream manager further comprises a rules module for storing and applying rules to said content list, wherein said rules govern at least a routing of said content list within said system, (e.g., col. 14, lines 25 – 48 & col. 23, lines 30 – 56).

22. Claims 12 – 17, 19 – 22, 24 – 46, 48 and 50 – 53 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

23. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

24. Claims 6, 11, 18 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buist in view of Loveman et al. (6211869) (hereinafter Loveman).

25. As per claim 6, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Buist does not specifically teach said packaging comprises compressing said message. Loveman teaches said packaging comprises compressing said message, (e.g., col. 4, line 47 – col. 5, line 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Loveman with Buist because by performing simultaneous capture of both the high resolution

Art Unit: 2143

version and the low resolution version of the media data, both forms of media data are immediately available in the system so that story editing can be performed to meet the stringent deadlines encountered in broadcast news operations even with late breaking material.

26. As per claim 11, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Buist does not specifically teach said step of transmitting comprises transmitting a low resolution version of a video object for review at said one or more field stations, said method further comprising:

27. receiving a request for a high resolution version of said video object from at least one field station; and

28. transmitting said high resolution version of said video object to said at least one field station. Loveman teaches said step of transmitting comprises transmitting a low resolution version of a video object for review at said one or more field stations, said method further comprising:

29. receiving a request for a high resolution version of said video object from at least one field station, (e.g., col. 4, line 47 – col. 5, line 4 & col. 19, lines 30 – 63); and

30. transmitting said high resolution version of said video object to said at least one field station, (e.g., col. 4, line 47 – col. 5, line 4 & col. 19, lines 30 – 63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Loveman with Buist because by performing simultaneous capture of both the high resolution version and the low resolution version of the media data, both forms of media data are immediately available in the system so that story editing can be performed to meet the stringent deadlines encountered in broadcast news operations even with late breaking material.

31. Claims 18 and 23 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

32. Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buist in view of Hino (6185863).

33. As per claim 47, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Buist does not specifically teach said object and stream manager further comprises a file parser for identifying the one or more references to the media objects in said content list. Hino teaches said object and stream manager further comprises a file parser for identifying the one or more references to the media objects in said content list, (e.g., col. 5, line 55 – col. 6, line 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hino with Buist because it would be more efficient for system to multiple users reference one media object on the system as opposed to multiple copies of said media object so to save storage space on the system.

Conclusion

34. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

35. a. Vigneaux et al. U.S. Patent No. 5852435 discloses Digital multimedia editing and data management system.

Art Unit: 2143

36. b. Butman et al. U.S. Patent No. 5867667 discloses Publication network control system using domain and client side communications resource locator lists for managing information communications between the domain server and publication servers.
37. c. Herz U.S. Patent No. 6460036 discloses System and method for providing customized electronic newspapers and target advertisements.
38. d. Dillon et al. U.S. Patent No. 6546488 discloses Broadcast delivery of information to a personal computer for local storage and access.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 571-272-3912. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David E. England
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

De 


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100